



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/741,994	12/22/2000	Paul Levi Williams JR.	088305/0121	7764

7590

07/07/2006

William T. Ellis
FOLEY & LARDNER
Suite 500
3000 K Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20007-5109

EXAMINER

CUFF, MICHAEL A

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

3627

DATE MAILED: 07/07/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE****U.S. Patent and Trademark Office**

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

APPLICATION NO./ CONTROL NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR / PATENT IN REEXAMINATION	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
---------------------------------	-------------	---	---------------------

09-741-994

EXAMINER

ART UNIT	PAPER
----------	-------

20060629

DATE MAILED:

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner for Patents

Appellant's reply brief, filed 6/21/06, has been received and considered.

Appellant cites two more areas in the specification to support the claim language "automatic determination by the host server ...". However, the actual claim language recites "automatically determining, by the host server, suitable electronic commerce EDI products or services for said user based at least in part on said requirements information from said selected trading partners: ...". Page 20, lines 20-27 discusses maintaining a user profile and has nothing to do with determining suitable electronic commerce EDI product, let alone what the determination is based on. Page 5 and 6 show a list of functions "controlled by the host server". The functions of a-f are merely steps of communication linking and login steps, which also have nothing to do with determining suitable electronic commerce EDI product, let alone what the determination is based on.

Appellant asserts that the examiner has not met the burden of inherency. The examiner believes that it has been shown that the elements in question are necessarily inherent in the disclosure and will rely on the arguments in the appeal brief.

Michael Cuff 6/29/06
MICHAEL CUFF
PRIMARY EXAMINER